HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

Second Appeal No.471/2007

Single Bench: **Hon'ble Shri Dilip Raosaheb Deshmukh, J.**

Appellants Plaintiffs

1. Kanhaiya, aged about 50 years, son of Late Shri Lakhan Satnami;
2. Jeevan, aged about 35 years, Son of Late Shri Lakhan Satnami;
   Both are resident of Village Ghatholi, Tahsil Lormi, District Bilaspur (C.G.)
3. Kamla Bai, aged about 52 years, D/o Late Shri Lakhan Satnami, Wife of Shri Pitamber Satnami, Resident of Village Koylari, Tahsil Lormi, District Bilaspur (C.G.)
4. Vijan Bai, aged about 32 years, D/o Late Shri Lakhan Satnami, Wife of Shri Sant Santnami, Resident of Village Amlideeh, Tahsil Lormi, District Bilaspur (C.G.)
5. Resham Bai, aged about 30 years, D/o Late Shri Lakhan Satnami, Wife of Shri Dujram Satnami, , R/o Village Nanapuri, Tahsil Pandariya, District Kawardha (C.G.)
6. Khel Bai, aged about 27 years, D/o Late Shri Lakhan Satnami, Wife of Shri Ganesh Satnami, Resident of Village Bhurka, Tahsil Lormi, District Bilaspur (C.G.)

Versus

Respondents Defendants

1. Dulari Bai, aged about 65 years, Wife of Shri Ved Prasad Pandey, Resident of Village Ghutur Kundi, Tahsil Pandariya, District Kawardha (C.G.)
2. Chaindas, aged about 57 years, son of Shri Sukharu;
3. Laindas, aged about 42 years, Son of Shri Lakharu;
4. Kanhaiya, aged about 37 years, Son of Shri Lakhan;
   The Respondent No.2 to 4 are resident of Village Ghatholi, Tahsil Lormi, District Bilaspur (C.G.)
5. State of Chhattisgarh, Through: The Collector, Bilaspur (C.G.)

Second Appeal under Section 100 of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908

Present:-
Malay Kumar Bhaduri, counsel for the appellants.

ORAL ORDER
(Passed on 05th November, 2007)

Heard on admission.

(2) The appellants are being aggrieved by the judgment and decree dated 30-06-2007 passed by the Additional District Judge, Mungeli, District Bilaspur in Civil Appeal No.54-A/2005 whereby the judgment and decree dated 09-11-2005 passed by the Civil Judge Class I, Mungeli in Civil Suit No.7-A/2002 whereby the suit was dismissed, was affirmed.

(3) During the course of arguments, learned counsel for the appellants has not been able to point out any ground for interference with the judgment and decree passed by both the Courts below.

(4) In this view of the matter as also the concurrent finding recorded by both the Courts below against the appellants/plaintiffs, no substantial question of law arises for determination in this appeal which is accordingly dismissed at the stage of admission.

Sd/-
Dilip Raosaheb Deshmukh
Judge

Tumane